

REMARKS

This response addresses the issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed June 19, 2006. Initially, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given in this case. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 3-7 are pending in this case. In view of the remarks presented herein, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for final allowance and notice to such effect is requested.

Here, Applicant claims a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack, the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space, the peg comprising an anterior portion to be introduced with clearance into the sleeve and a posterior fixing part, wherein the posterior part of the peg is designed to compensate for the clearance, the diameter of the posterior fixing part of the peg being greater than the diameter of the sleeve, and the peg being slotted.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,612,687 to Cescon et al. ("Cescon") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,630,983 to Fischer ("Fischer") and U.S. Patent No. 5,850,676 to Takahashi et al. ("Takahashi"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

The Examiner acknowledged that Cescon is silent as to how the inertial rack unit is fixed to the rack and that Cescon does not disclose a plurality of assemblies. The Examiner then refers to Fischer to cure this deficiency. The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Cescon, such that the inertial is fixed to the rack by peg and slot assembly of Fischer, to maintain a snug fit between the peg and slot and in turn, maintain the connection. Also, the Examiner has conceded that Fischer discloses only one assembly of a peg and sleeve, not a plurality as claimed. The Examiner then refers to Takahashi to cure this deficiency. Accordingly, the Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention to modify Cescon, such that a plurality of pegs and sleeves, as taught by Takahashi are used to fasten to the rack to the inertial unit. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In order to establish obviousness of a claimed invention, all elements of the claims must be disclosed, taught or suggested by the prior art. None of the references teach a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Cescon is silent as to how the inertial rack unit is fixed to the rack and that Cescon does not disclose a plurality of assemblies. Cescon discloses an aircraft comprising an inertial unit fixed on a rack See Abstract. However, Cescon does not disclose the problem raised by the fixation of an inertial unit to a rack with a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve let alone a solution to fix the problem raised in the present invention. Cescon also does not teach modifying the expansion pin for a piece of masonry in order to have it function on an inertial unit of an aircraft. Further, the field of invention in Cescon is completely different from the Fischer. Cescon is concerned with the technical field of aircrafts whereas Fischer discloses clamping an article to a piece of masonry. In contrast, Applicant's invention discloses fixing an inertial unit of an aircraft to a rack of an aircraft.

In regards to Fischer, Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Fischer does not disclose plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit and a rack. Fischer discloses an expansion pin that is a particular type of nail, which is driven into a hole. This nail is drilled through the article and the piece of masonry by means of a strong hammer. See Col 3, lines 44-6767. This expansion pin is capable of further expansion should the drill hole become wider. See Col. 1, lines 29-32. The expansion pin in Fischer has a shank which can be expanded by means of an expansion element that engages in an aperture region. See Col. 1, lines 5-10. However, Fischer does not disclose a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data

which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space. Further, the field of invention in Fischer is completely different from the present invention. Fischer discloses clamping an article to a piece of masonry whereas Applicant's invention discloses fixing an inertial unit of an aircraft to a rack of an aircraft.

In regards to Takahashi, Takahashi discloses a clip with engaging mechanism. See Col. 1, lines 9-19. The clip in Takahashi comprises a male member and a female member, the latter comprising elastic pieces, to connect two or more panels, the clips being arranged so that the elastic pieces are prevented from being deviated when deviating force is applied. Takahashi does not disclose a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space. In contrast, in the present invention, the pegs are part of one of the inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft, and the sleeves are part of the other one. This is unlike Takahashi, where both members are independent from the two pieces to be fixed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submit that the claimed plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft is not obvious over the teaching of Cescon in view of Fischer and Takahashi. Further, the problem of simultaneous push-fitting of a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve is not disclosed in Cescon, Fischer or Takahashi. In addition, one skilled in the art would find nothing in Cescon, Fischer or Takahashi alone or in combination that would disclose, teach or suggest the claimed composition or any reason for making it. This is because there is no motivation taught in any of the references to combine the references in such a way to provide the plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,612,687 to Cescon et al. ("Cescon") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,630,983 to Fischer ("Fischer") and U.S. Patent No. 5,850,676 to Takahashi et al. ("Takahashi") as applied to claim 6 above, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,962,775 to

King, Jr. ("King"). This rejection is respectfully traversed and believed overcome in view of the following discussion.

The Examiner argues that King teaches the use of graphite on an expansion, in a sleeve, such as graphite, as a lubricant. Accordingly, the Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Cescon, Fischer and Takahashi, such that a graphite deposit is included on the peg of Fischer, to lubricate the peg, thereby allowing easier insertion into the sleeve. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In order to establish obviousness of a claimed invention, all elements of the claims must be disclosed, taught or suggested by the prior art. None of the references teach a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Cescon, Fischer and Takahashi do not disclose the peg to be coated with a graphite deposit. As stated above, Cescon, Fischer and Takahashi do not disclose a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space.

In regards to King, King discloses a fastener guide assembly. See Abstract. However, King does not disclose do not disclose a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft which are intended to be push-fitted simultaneously one into the other to fix the inertial unit to the rack where the inertial unit comprising inertial sensors which, in real time, measure acceleration and rotation data which are then compiled in a mathematical model in order to deduce therefrom the position of the aircraft in space.

Applicant respectfully submit that the claimed plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft is not obvious over the teaching of Cescon in view of either Fischer, Takahashi or King. In addition, one skilled in the art would find nothing in Cescon, Fischer, Takahashi or King alone or in combination that would disclose, teach or suggest the claimed composition or any reason for making it. This is because there is no motivation taught in any of the references to combine the references in such a way to provide the plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit of an aircraft and a rack of an aircraft as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

In view of the remarks presented herein, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for final allowance and notice to such effect is requested. If the Examiner believes that additional issues need to be resolved before this application can be passed to issue, the undersigned invites the Examiner to contact her at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 19, 2006

By Sylvia Tan
Sylvia Tan
Reg. No. 47,324
GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
(212) 801-9200